

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 52 and 56 were objected to for allegedly being incomplete as presented.

Claims 34, 35, 37-39, 44, 45, 48, 50, 53, 54, and 57-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 23-51, 53-55, and 57-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bond et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,940) in view of Gray (U.S. Patent No. 6,149,585).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 34, 37-39, 44, 48, 52-54, and 56-59. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 23-59 are pending for consideration.

The Objection to Claims 52 and 56

Claims 52 and 56 stand objected to for allegedly being incomplete as presented. Applicants have amended claims 52 and 56 to address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 34, 35, 37-39, 44, 45, 48, 50, 53, 54, and 57-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

However, the Office Action does not provide and statements regarding the rejection of claims 35 and 45. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide such a statement or that the rejection of claims 35 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn

With respect to the remaining rejections, Applicants have amended claims 34, 37-39, 44, 48, 53, 54, and 57-59 to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Thus, Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 34, 37-39, 44, 48, 53, 54, and 57-59, as amended, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 23-51, 53-55, and 57-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bond et al. in view of Gray. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 23. Independent claim 23 recites, *inter alia*, "an interview configuration selection mechanism by which one of a clinician . . . designate an interview configuration profile for a patient, set up patient interview schedules, and

designate a receiving physician for receiving a patient report” At least this feature of independent claim 23 is neither taught nor suggested by the applied references.

With reference to Bond et al., Page 4 of the Office Action dated December 31, 2002, states that “FIG. 16 is the interview configuration selector which allows the physician to select the particular type of interview desired.” Applicants respectfully disagree that FIG. 16 of Bond et al. discloses each every element of the “interview configuration selection mechanism” recited in independent claim 23. As noted at column 17, lines 34-43, Fig. 16 represents a menu relating to a patient’s general condition. Fig. 16 does not disclose an interview configuration selection mechanism that enables a clinician, for example, to “designate an interview configuration profile for a patient, set up patient interview schedules, and designate a receiving physician for receiving a patient report,” as recited in independent claim 23.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied references do not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 23. Furthermore, Applicants assert that dependent claim 24-51, 53-55, and 57-59 are allowable at least because of its dependence from independent claim 23 and the reasons set forth above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 23-51, 53-55, and 57-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at 202.739.5271 to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.1 36(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:


Todd P. Taylor
Reg. No. 48,513

Dated: June 30, 2003

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001